

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/526,906	10/13/2005	Yasushi Nakayama	1188-0126PUS1	1188-0126PUS1 7846	
2292	7590 07/21/2006		EXAMINER		
	EWART KOLASCH &	LU, C CAIXIA			
PO BOX 74 FALLS CH	7 URCH, VA 22040-074	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1713		
			DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					V			
		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/526,9	06	NAKAYAMA ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit				
		Caixia Lu		1713				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication	on appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
Period fo	• •							
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR INCHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INSIGNS OF THE MAILING INSIGNS OF THE MAILING INSIGNS OF THE MAILING INSIGNS OF THE MAILING IN PRICE OF THE MAILING IN T	NG DATE OF TI CFR 1.136(a). In no ev tion. period will apply and w y statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION rent, however, may a reply be tin rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	n 09 June 2006.						
		This action is r	on-final.					
′	'=							
	closed in accordance with the practice up	· ·	•					
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4) 又	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the applica	ation.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4-9</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election r	equirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🗌 :	The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
· ·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[objected to by the I	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection	· /						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	correction is requir	ed if the drawing(s) is obj	jected to. See 37 CFR	t 1.121(d).			
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by t	the Examiner. No	ote the attached Office	Action or form PTC)-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo ☑ All b)☐ Some * c)⊡ None of:	oreign priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
u) _E	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority docu	iments have bee	n received					
	2. Certified copies of the priority docu			on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the				tage			
	application from the International E				90			
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for		· · · ·	d.				
A4400b=4	V-N							
Attachment	c(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(DTO 442)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	48)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) 🔯 Infom	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/s No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/7/05</u> .		5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:		52)			

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-3, in the reply filed on June 9, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no reason to divide the catalyst from a compositing containing the catalyst. This is not incorrect since the current restriction is restricting the support of a catalyst from the supported catalyst composition. The support of the catalyst does not contain the catalyst.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Specification

- 2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Japanese is used in the disclosure on page 8. Appropriate correction is required.
- 3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kioka et al. (US 5,091,353).



Art Unit: 1713

Kioka teaches the preparation of a hydrocarbon solvent insoluble magnesium/aluminum solid complex support derived from a liquid magnesium compound and an organoaluminum compound (col. 7, lines 15-42). Kioka's Example 1 demonstrates the preparation of magnesium/aluminum solid support by reacting magnesium chloride, 2-ethylhexyl alcohol, triethyl aluminum at 80 °C to provide a solid product and then further treat the solid with diethyl aluminum chloride at 80 °C to provide the magnesium/aluminum solid support (col. 14, Example 1, and col. 20, Table 1). Kioka's magnesium/aluminum solid supports listed in Table 1 meet all of the limitations of the instant claims except the molar ratios of alkoxy/Al are in the range of 2.9 to 4.7 (calculated from the data of Table 1) rather than in the range of 0.05 to 2.0 of the instant claims. However, Kioka does teach the molar ratio of Al/Mg in the range of 0.05 to 1.0 in line 31 of col. 7. Therefore, when more of organoaluminum compound is used in the first and second organoaluminum compound treatments during the preparation of magnesium/aluminum solid support in Example 1, the molar ratio of Al/Mg would increase and the alkoxy/Al ratio would decrease.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to employ Kioka's teaching to prepare the magnesium/aluminum solid support with the molar ratio of Al/Mg near the high end of the range of 0.05 to 1.0 in order to maximize the cocatalyst content in the support since such is within the scope of Kioka's teaching and in the absence of any showing criticality and unexpected results. When the molar ratio of Al/Mg is near the high end of the range of 0.05 to 1.0, the molar ratio of alkoxy/Al of the support would be in the range of the instant claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/526,906

Art Unit: 1713

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful and the matter is urgent, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571) 272-1114. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner

Page 4